

1

2

3

4

5

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

6

7

8

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1999

9

10

11

CORONADO, CALIFORNIA

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

REPORTED BY: Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870

- 1 **ATTENDANCE:**
- 2 John Locke
- 3 Richard Mach
- 4 Debbie Wankier
- 5 Bill Collins
- 6 Rick Phillips
- 7 Stephan Dirtadian
- 8 Bob Geilenfeldt
- 9 Ken Branch
- 10 Scott Morris
- 11 Foster Marshall
- 12 Mark Bonsavage
- 13 David Rodriguez
- 14 Janet Lear
- 15 Rick Basinet
- 16 Bob Logan
- 17 Scott Haley
- 18 Jorge Matos
- 19 Marilyn Field
- 20

1 **CORONADO, CA., THURS., SEPTEMBER 16, 1999, 6:35 P.M.**

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Thanks everybody for coming to the Naval Air Station North
4 Island RAB meeting for September 16th.

5 Carla Fargo won't be with us tonight. She's returning from El Centro in a project
6 that she's working on.

7 The first item of business tonight is to approve the minutes from August 11th.
8 Has everybody had a chance to read them? Do they appear okay?

9 We need somebody to motion to accept them?

10 MR. GEILENFELDT: Motion to accept the minutes.

11 MR. COLLINS: Second?

12 MR. MARSHALL: Second.

13 MR. COLLINS: All in favor? It passes.

14 The second item of interest will be a presentation on Site 9, soil vapor extraction
15 with steam injection and free product recovery update.

16 MR. MACH: I presented where we're going with the Site 9 soil vapor extraction
17 steam injection project several times in the past, and I've told you we're starting with the pilot test.

18 I'd like to introduce Scott Haley from OHM. He's going to give you the details
19 as to what we've done so far and where we're going with this project. Go ahead, Scott.

20 MR. MORRIS: Did everybody get one of the handouts that Scott's going to talk
21 from? If not, I can grab a couple. He's got a little map on it.

22 Does anybody else need one?

1 MR. HALEY: Just to give everybody a heads up on the handout, changes from the
2 previous presentation have been italicized so you can quickly look at the changes.

3 As Richard Mach was saying, I think last time we were finishing up the
4 construction for the pilot test, and now that is fully completed, and we start a 24-hour operation of
5 the pilot test out at Site 9, Area 1, beginning this Saturday, and that includes soil vapor extraction,
6 steam injection, and free product recovery with skimmer pumps.

7 To date so far the skimmer pumps have removed about 75 gallons. We expect
8 to see an increase in the amount of free product that we've collected, now what we're heating up
9 the subsurface and now that we have a temperature gradient between the positive pressure steam
10 that we're injecting and the vacuum that we're using for the soil vapor extraction.

11 We expect the pilot test to continue through September and probably almost
12 entirely through October. During this time, we're collecting a lot of data, subsurface temperatures.
13 We're collecting soil vapor samples to test for what chemicals were volatilizing; and at the end of
14 this pilot test, which I said would probably be around the end of October, we will be looking over
15 all of our data and using that data for the final design.

16 So we're looking to finalize the design of the site about November and
17 December, and we're looking at construction beginning at about the beginning of the year 2000.
18 That's it.

19 Any questions?

20 MR. MACH: Do you recall also we have sent out the Work Plan Addendum for
21 review. The comment period ended in August. The only person we received any comments from
22 was Rafat Abbasi at DTSC.

23 We drafted some draft responses for him. We had a meeting with him this
24 afternoon. He took a look at those, and they were all acceptable to him. His comments were pretty

1 minor, and so we're going to be drafting a formal response to the comment letter to him. We do
2 not need to revise the Work Plan Addendum. We're just going to address all his comments via
3 letter and move forward.

4 The only question he really had was he wanted three additional wells put in, and
5 we concurred with that and said, "Sure. We'll put them in" and we had a diagram.

6 So once that response to comments goes out, you all will receive a copy of that.

7 MR. GEILENFELDT: So, Scott, in November then we're going to have some kind
8 of an evaluation report on how this extraction system is working in this particular project?

9 MR. HALEY: I believe we can provide that if it's --

10 MR. GEILENFELDT: Well, I mean if this is -- you said it was a pilot test.

11 MR. HALEY: It's a pilot test; right.

12 MR. GEILENFELDT: And you said for the end of October, then you were going to
13 then start the major project about the first of the year.

14 MR. HALEY: Right. We're expecting this to end about the end of October. At that
15 time I'm sure that we could --

16 MR. GEILENFELDT: So in your opinion right now this system is working for this
17 situation?

18 MR. HALEY: I'm sorry?

19 MR. GEILENFELDT: This system is working for this situation.

20 MR. MACH: We're confident that the system is appropriate for this site. Like Scott
21 said, the major thing we're trying to get out of the pilot test is to refine the design parameters so

1 that we can go full scale. We optimize how close together the wells are spaced to verify that we're
2 getting a temperature out to all the areas and if we need a vacuum to recover that.

3 We're not doing this to say, "Hey, does this work or does it not work?" We put
4 the wells 45 feet apart or 40 feet apart or 70 feet apart so that we can get the best system in there
5 for the cheapest cost and get done in a reasonable time frame.

6 MR. GEILENFELDT: Great. Thank you.

7 MR. COLLINS: Thank you.

8 Our next presentation will be on the Site 1 confined disposal facility
9 investigation that's been going on there. Mark Bonsavage.

10 MR. BONSAVAGE: Janet's going to do it.

11 MS. LEAR: My name is Janet Lear. I'm with the Bechtel Navy CLEAN contract.
12 I'm the CTO lead for the Site 1 RI.

13 And this is David Rodriguez. He's the GIS specialist at Bechtel.

14 I just want to give you an update of what's been going on out at Site 1, Shoreline
15 Sediment, Outfalls 9-15.

16 Site 1, Outfalls 9-15 -- well, actually, all of Site 1 was identified as an IR site in
17 1983 due to historical discharges of industrial waste from the storm drain system, the outfalls into
18 the bay.

19 The Outfalls 9-15 are located right along here in red and here. I should also
20 mention that there are handouts on the back table with copies of some of the figures as well as
21 some notes. So, hopefully, everybody got that.

1 In 1995 the Navy issued an Action Memo regarding the time critical removal
2 action for the Outfalls 9-15, which took into account the construction project for the CVN
3 Homeport.

4 The construction project consisted of dredging the turning basin and approach
5 and constructing approximately a 13-acre fill area behind a rock dike, which is located in this area.

6 The dredge footprint towards the turning basin is right through -- in this area
7 right here.

8 The Action Memo for the homeporting project for Site 1, Outfalls 9-15, all the
9 sediments that were dredged in the turning basin that were determined to be unsuitable for ocean
10 disposal were put behind the rock dike. This fill area then was known as the compliance disposal
11 facility.

12 Prior to this time, there were several studies done in this area to evaluate the
13 concentrations of contaminants that were in the sediments offshore at these outfalls. Some of the
14 items -- some of the chemicals that were identified included metals, PCBs, and PAHs.

15 This is a representation of the dredged area for the footings of the CDF. This
16 shows the footings for the CDF construction. These are for the copper concentrations.

17 These, again, are the locations of some of the samples that were collected prior
18 to the construction. As you can see, a lot of the sample locations are either within the sides of the
19 CDF footprint or in the footing of the CDF where this material was dredged out, as well as in the
20 larger area of dredge removal for the turning basin.

21 As a result, the majority of the concentrations detected during the previous
22 investigation are now inside this CDF either as a result of dredge and placement inside or -- and
23 this material that wasn't moved that was inside here is also buried underneath the material that was
24 put in top.

1 In the construction of this, 10 to 14 feet of clean fill were then placed on top
2 above the in situ Site 1 material, the material that was there before and wasn't moved; and then on
3 top of that the dredged-fill sediments were placed and another, like I said, 10 to 14 feet of clean
4 fill on top of that.

5 In addition to that, there's a 50-foot buffer zone of clean fill between the rock
6 dike wall and these dredged-fill sediments.

7 This is a figure showing the construction of the CDF. This is the wharf, and
8 then this is the approximate area of the dredged- fill material from the turning basin footprint. And
9 then on top of that you have your -- this is the 50-foot buffer between the rock dike wall and the
10 dredged-fill sediment; and then on top of that you have 10 to 14 feet of clean fill as well as an
11 asphalt and/or concrete cap.

12 This is a two-dimensional representation of the CDF and the scope of the
13 Outfalls 9-15, Site 1 RI. The purpose of it is to evaluate whether any contaminants in the in situ
14 Site 1 sediments and/or the dredged-fill sediments that were placed behind the rock dike wall,
15 whether these materials could potentially leach into the groundwater and travel into the bay
16 creating a potential risk to human health and/or the environment.

17 To evaluate this, we installed 15 wells around the CDF area: 10 compliance
18 wells, which were along the edge here between the dredged-fill sediments and the bay, as well as
19 three upgradient wells, and two wells located in the interior of the CDF.

20 We have monitored these wells for three quarters for a variety of constituents,
21 and then we will evaluate -- we've evaluated those contaminant concentrations against our project
22 threshold levels.

23 Our project threshold levels are the lowest or most conservative of National
24 Ambient Water Quality Criteria for saltwater aquatic life, for human health protection, and/or the
25 Department of Toxic Substances Control Applied Action Levels. Whichever is the lowest of

1 those three, that's what we're using to conduct this preliminary screen on the groundwater
2 concentrations.

3 Any exceedences of those project threshold levels will then trigger us into the
4 next phase of our investigation which is the performance of risk assessment for both ecological
5 and human health.

6 And these are the results of our first three quarters. This shows exceedences of
7 copper in our groundwater wells. And, as you can see, we exceed our project threshold levels not
8 only in our compliance wells, but also in the wells upgradient of the CDF. This may indicate that
9 this is a background situation, but nonetheless, we'll proceed with the risk assessment and
10 background will be evaluated during that process.

11 This figure shows zinc exceedence in these two compliance wells right here.
12 There's actually a cluster of two wells there. So zinc is one of the metals that will go to the next
13 phase of the investigation.

14 And arsenic also is fairly pervasive in all the wells, including the compliance
15 wells as
16 well as the upgradient wells.

17 This figure shows that nickel exceeded project threshold levels in this cluster of
18 wells right here.

19 And this figure represents PAHs. This is a summation of all the PAHs in the
20 wells compared to the project threshold levels. The highest concentrations are once again in this
21 well right there, although we do have exceedences in all of the compliance wells or the majority of
22 the compliance wells, I should say.

23 MR. MACH: Could you explain, for those who don't know, what PAHs are, please?

24 MS. LEAR: I'm sorry?

1 MR. MACH: Could you explain, for those who don't know, what PAHs are?

2 MS. LEAR: Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons.

3 MR. MACH: Right. Similar to those substances like diesel fuel and other heavy
4 hydrocarbon type stuff.

5 MS. LEAR: Yes. It's also fairly common in the bay as well from creosote pilings, et
6 cetera.

7 PAHs are one of the chemicals that were found in the sediments both in dredged
8 fill and the Site 1 sediments in the previous investigations.

9 MR. MACH: The only reason I ask is because we haven't really mentioned PAHs
10 here, so most of the RAB members probably don't know what they are.

11 MS. LEAR: We also found TCE in concentrations exceeding our project threshold
12 levels in two wells -- two compliance wells at the CDF. These two right here, I believe. These
13 were only in the deep wells.

14 And this figure is meant to show that there is an upgradient TCE plume in this
15 area, which is more than likely where our exceedences are coming from in the CDF wells. This is
16 going to be discussed -- this area, OEM 19 and 20, will be discussed in the next presentation.

17 Well, that is what we have found so far in our quarterly monitoring. We have
18 one more quarter to go. We've already taken the samples, but the results aren't in yet.

19 So the tasks remaining on this project are to evaluate that fourth quarter data,
20 perform our ecological and human health risk assessment using the results of the monitoring data,
21 and prepare the RI report which we expect to submit to the Navy by the end of December. After
22 that time, the monitoring at the CDF wells will continue on a quarterly basis for at least another
23 year.

1 Are there any questions?

2 MR. COLLINS: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. HALEY: Janet, can you leave that up for just a minute just so when I come up,
4 I can show the group where our site is, since you've got it set up there real nice.

5 MS. LEAR: Okay.

6 MS. FIELD: I guess I have a question.

7 Does this mean that the CDF is not functioning as it's supposed to, the fact that
8 you have gotten these contaminants up to these wells? The contaminants were supposed to be
9 entombed in the CDF, and are you drilling wells down beneath the entombment? Is that what
10 you're doing?

11 I know I'm not expressing this right because I don't understand it well enough,
12 but is the fact that you're getting exceedences indicating anything about the functioning of the
13 CDF?

14 MS. LEAR: No. At this point what we're measuring is the groundwater
15 concentrations in wells inside of the CDF but on the edge, and that's the closest we can get to the
16 bay; right?

17 So what we would then do is do a risk assessment based on the concentrations in
18 those wells, assuming that all of that were to get into the bay, and evaluate the impact of that.
19 That doesn't mean that the CDF isn't doing its job because we're still measuring concentrations
20 inside the CDF.

21 MR. BONSAVAGE: When we set up -- when we say it's an exceedence, you have
22 to remember that what we're comparing it against are the most conservative values we can find
23 between the Water Board and DTSC. So we picked the lowest or the most conservative value and
24 we screened it against it.

1 Now, you'll notice that some of ours a lot of times are up. Even our upgradient
2 wells will have exceedences to these very conservative values. It doesn't mean that it's not
3 functioning. It just means that all of the groundwater has concentrations that are higher than this
4 threshold.

5 And what we'll do, the next step is -- well, number one, is to look at the
6 background and see if it's actually in the background; and then the second step on that would be to
7 actually see what kind of risk it is. You look into the risks on the exposures and the pathways of it
8 actually getting into the bay.

9 And another thing you'll notice is that these aren't graded even pretty close to
10 these very conservative thresholds. So I would say that, no, it's not an indication that it's not
11 doing its job.

12 MS. FIELD: Well, I guess I'm not quite understanding the purpose of this. You
13 knew you had extremely toxic stuff that was being entombed in the CDF, and it seems like you're
14 now measuring what you knew was already there?

15 MR. BONSAVAGE: Well, first, the stuff that was put in here really wasn't toxic.
16 It's just it was not suitable for ocean disposal. It wasn't that it was toxic material.

17 MS. FIELD: Why was it not suitable for ocean disposal?

18 MR. BONSAVAGE: I think if it fails the toxicity tests, I think that's what happened
19 for this material, and --

20 MR. MACH: You know, a lot of the toxicity tests that it failed didn't have to do with
21 the chemicals concerning it. It had to do with the grain size of the material. And so the critters
22 that could be exposed to the size of the material -- the sand, the silt, whatever was being dredged --
23 that was what was causing the toxic effect, not the chemicals.

1 MR. BONSAVAGE: And when you do toxicity tests, sometimes you can't really
2 tell what's causing the toxicity. You're not measuring all the chemicals.

3 But the real purpose behind this first attempt -- it's not really an attempt -- but
4 this first round of four quarters of sampling is to screen out chemicals that are not really a concern
5 at this site. We only showed a handful of chemicals, but we actually analyzed like hundreds of
6 chemicals, which added up to quite a bit of lab fees.

7 And after four quarters of sampling, we're hoping that we can cut down on what
8 chemicals we actually look at, and focus in on the ones that actually may have a problem instead
9 of spending a lot of money on chemicals that aren't there.

10 So that's really the main purpose behind the first -- our first screening level look
11 at a site.

12 MS. FIELD: But this is all entombed, presumably. You think it's not going to
13 escape -- the toxic stuff that's there, how would it escape the CDF?

14 MR. BONSAVAGE: Well, theoretically -- well, the other thing you have to
15 remember is we did do a model of the site where we took the actual sediment that was inside the
16 CDF, and we did a split partitioning where we analyzed it and put a sample in as to how much of
17 the material actually dissolved into the groundwater, and then we did a model on how many years
18 it would actually take for this to get through our barrier -- our 50-foot barrier and reach the bay.

19 And from our model we concluded that by the time it reached the bay, the levels
20 would be not toxic -- I don't want to say "not toxic," but they wouldn't be above our concern.

21 MR. COLLINS: Greatly reduced. Not of concern.

22 Part of the problem at this site was -- and you remember, because you've been
23 coming to the RAB for a long time -- is that we did bury IR Site

1 1, and that's where the more toxic material was. And before this happened, this stuff was exposed
2 on a daily basis for over 50 years to the bay.

3 And in theory, if you were a diver and could get down there, as explained before
4 in the risk, if you could live at the bottom of the bay and eat this dirt and water and have your
5 whole life down there, there was some additional risk for a cancer. However, we have removed
6 that immediate threat by putting this CDF blanket over the entire site. You can no longer get to
7 that contaminated material. You'd have to burrow down 40 feet out towards the rock wall. You'd
8 have to go quite a ways down to get to this contaminated material.

9 And now if the water -- let's say the water came through there and dissolved
10 something and pushed it off towards the bay. It's highly unlikely that it would get there in any
11 great value that would cause a problem, and the risk that the site presented in the past has been
12 reduced.

13 What we're doing in this program is completing the RI on the site to make sure
14 that we fully understand what we had there, and also that the cure that we implemented with the
15 CDF as the blanket over the site is effective and would be the final cure.

16 MS. FIELD: How does this test the effectiveness of the CDF since you're drilling
17 down through it; right?

18 MR. MACH: I think what you're going to find is once they finish looking at all these
19 chemicals, there was nothing that was detected that is a concern that's not background.

20 The VOCs or the TCE and the other chlorinated compounds are not from this
21 site. They're coming from the site that we're about to present, and those are something that we're
22 definitely going to address.

23 The SVOC's or the PAH's that were presented, they had the lowest screen level
24 I've ever seen in my life. It was like .03 parts per billion. The Water Board closes sites out at 300

1 parts per billion, so it's like five forces of magnitude for what they were screening for, and I think
2 the highest that they had was 2. So that's 2 orders of magnitude less than what the Water Board
3 will close out on any normal tank site anywhere within a thousand feet of the bay.

4 Your metals -- take copper, for instance. They have a screening level of 2.4
5 parts per billion. Although in the work that I've done, I've always used 2.9. That's what the Water
6 Board has used for their Base and Estuary Standard.

7 If you recall, we did the removal action for the tributyl tin and copper down at
8 the Marina A and B. We went in. We put in wells. We took groundwater samples to verify that
9 once we cleaned up the soil, nothing got down into the groundwater. We checked against the 2.9,
10 and everything we got was between 2.9 and 10.

11 Similar sites in North Island have been between 2.9 and 10. What they got was
12 between 2.4 and 14, so it looks like it's all background. That is naturally occurring everywhere in
13 the sediment in the bay, everywhere on North Island, everywhere in this beach sand -- that's what's
14 everywhere. So that's what you're going to get no matter where you go, so it's not coming out of
15 the CDF. It's just what's naturally there.

16 The arsenic, arsenic is a big chemical. Here our background on North Island in
17 the soil is 5.62 parts per million. So they're coming up with something in the groundwater. In this
18 background and in the sediment and in the CDF area it's all background. It's not any different than
19 what's there. They're not really detecting anything that is not naturally occurring.

20 MS. FIELD: So what you're saying is that maybe that since you're getting so little
21 out of the CDF itself that maybe you don't need to worry about whether the CDF is functioning
22 since the --

23 MR. MACH: We will continue to monitor it and verify that nothing changes over
24 time; however, what they're showing right now is that you can't detect anything above

1 background in the CDF or downgradient of the CDF. So it's not leaching through, and it's all
2 consistent with what's upgradient.

3 MR. COLLINS: And it's really because of that, there's no reason to be overly
4 concerned from any contamination because it just isn't there.

5 But we will go through all of these steps required under the law to show the
6 possible presentation of this.

7 MR. BONSAVAGE: And we plan to continue monitoring it, but our idea is to
8 reduce the number of chemicals that you look at and concentrate on the ones that really may be a
9 concern at the site.

10 MS. FIELD: Thank you.

11 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. Before you turn the machine off, our next presentation
12 is on the Operable Units 19 and 20 soil and groundwater investigation update.

13 MR. MACH: Again, about two months ago I made a long presentation on Operable
14 Units 19 and 20. That's the Buildings 379, 397, and 472 area, and I went through about three
15 phases of the investigation we've gone through where we went from the small free product plume
16 to a larger free product plume of a swollen nature floating on groundwater to finding TCE in the
17 free product and in the groundwater in several generations of groundwater investigation, and I said
18 we're going to go for one last one, and we hope to get to the end of it.

19 Well, we're going to present what we found, and we think we've probably got to
20 the end of our contamination, which is just the beginning of the next problem.

21 So we're going to show you this. We had a meeting with the regulators today.
22 We're going to put in some additional groundwater monitoring wells and complete the remedial
23 investigation for the portion that we set out for, and then hopefully we will move forward with the

1 removal action to reduce the source area on our site, and then we're going to have to come back
2 and look at this other downgradient problem that we just encountered.

3 So I'd like to introduce Scott Morris from OHM who's going to go through and
4 essentially present what we found from June till now and where we're going from here.

5 MR. MORRIS: Thanks, Rich.

6 Again, Scott Morris with OHM. I'm the project manager for this undertaking
7 for the Navy. Jorge Matos, environmental engineer, that's helping me get all this data into some
8 animation we're going to show you real quick.

9 I do have kind of a little history where we just were and where we're going sheet
10 with some figures. If anybody didn't get one, I've got a couple of them here. They're on the back
11 table. Everybody's set with that?

12 Mr. Mach did an excellent job at summarizing everything that's on there, so I'm
13 not going to go through all of that. You can read it on your own, and I'll go ahead and get right to
14 it.

15 We've just recently finished essentially round 4 of collecting data, and we have
16 so many data points, we're very comfortable with what we're looking at at our site.

17 As Rich alluded to, unfortunately, in all of our investigative work, we found
18 something new and that will come up.

19 Before Jorge switches the computers, because he's got all his software on his
20 computer, and we haven't quite gotten into the microage yet with these fairly intensive animations,
21 I wanted to take advantage of Janet's little site map.

22 Our project is where all those little red hits are. That's Building 379, which is
23 the NADEP -- the Naval Aviation Depo where they do a lot of their aircraft maintenance -- and

1 that's where we had the original beginning of our project. That's where the contamination was
2 found in the TCE. We have a lot of free product in that area.

3 And we've kind of been looking and then we stepped it out. We found that the
4 groundwater got contaminated out here in Building 379. What we're going to present right now is
5 we looked all over out here to verify where our plume had gone, and that's what we're going to
6 present.

7 With that, I'll just kind of kill a couple of minutes here and talk while Jorge real
8 quickly switches over the computers, and he's got a little graphics program that takes all the data
9 that we've obtained through a number of different means. We've installed classic monitoring wells
10 that you drill them and install them and they're there. You can go sample them all the time.

11 We've used an innovative sampling technique. It's delivered through a SCAPS
12 rig, which essentially is a big, giant, five ton type of truck that pushes a rod and pushes a sample
13 probe own into the ground, and then it can collect samples at depths as it goes down.

14 We've used a couple of different probes with that, and Rich has been able to get
15 some funding for this research through the Army Corps of Engineers research arm, and they've
16 come out and tested their probes out here on our sites, so it's been kind of a cost advantageous way
17 to go, and it's the latest, greatest way to quickly obtain data at the site and obtain results literally
18 ten minutes after you collect the sample. So you really can make decisions as you go. Instead of
19 going out there and installing some wells and taking samples and coming back literally weeks later
20 with information then remobilizing, you're taking samples and moving and extending your spread
21 until you have your arms on it.

22 So we have done that, and we have compiled all of that information into a
23 graphic display, which this is our -- if you remember, this is these two buildings that I talked
24 about: 379 and 472. The CVN is a little bit off the page here, but I wanted to use that map
25 because it does a better job giving you a visual reference.

1 This is the plume as we have found it of TCE. We use TCE as our screening
2 tool because that was the highest contaminant that we were encountering. This is all -- the 92
3 parts per billion is kind of our target concentration. So as you can see, it's gone out there pretty
4 good, and Rich alluded to it. It's opened up some new issues.

5 Jorge, let me go ahead and have you do some peeling away of this. What Jorge's
6 going to do now is if you'd watch up here, it's hard to see, but the concentrations are going up.
7 And so it's kind of like an onion peeling right now.

8 I'm going to go ahead and let it run through. As you can see, over here is the
9 concentrations. Right now we're at 10,000 parts per billion, and it's getting up there pretty high,
10 50,000. As you can see, we've kind of got two spots. This is our project site, and then we've got
11 this surprise we came up with over here in the Building 1,2 area which are just -- as Rich said, just
12 base side of the CDN.

13 Now, this shows all those data points, all the wells that we've installed. All the
14 little dots are where we collected data. So it's really a tremendous amount of information which
15 we couldn't have got that much information without a SCAPS type of direct push sampler. It's
16 got a ton of information in a short amount of time really for a pretty low dollar amount to collect
17 that much information.

18 Go ahead and run that one more time, Jorge, and stop it where we can kind of
19 talk about where we're going next. A little bit further.

20 What it sure appears right now from all the data that we've collected, we've got
21 our plume source that we've been tracking from the beginning, and then we've got something new.

22 What we're looking to do right now is we've got one last set of wells we want to
23 install. And as Rich said, we had a meeting with the Water Board and the DTSC today to kind of
24 get them to buy into our thinking.

1 What we want to do is put two rows of monitoring wells all the way down to
2 where the water table ends and we get to the clay layer and confirm that we have in fact a
3 boundary between our little site here and something new, because this something new if we just
4 revealed it and it's going to be a pretty long time before we fully get all the data and move forward
5 to some kind of cleanup, so we don't want to just put this on the back shelf until we address this
6 new one.

7 So we're proposing to split this thing in half, which it physically appears to be
8 the case. We've got some new source over here, which I don't even want to make any statements
9 on what this could be, but we put in some new wells right here to confirm that we have two
10 separate plumes, and then treat this as its own entity and move forward with proposing some
11 remediation and actually go clean it up.

12 And then this will be addressed -- the Navy will address this as probably another
13 project, and it's going to have a life of its own.

14 MS. FIELD: But what is it? Is it the same?

15 MR. MORRIS: It's a piece -- it's tetrachloroethylene. It's a volatile organic carbon.

16 MR. MACH: Trichloroethene.

17 MS. FIELD: But it's the same stuff?

18 MR. MORRIS: Yes. We were screening for only that TCE. We don't know if
19 there's other things in this one, but here that is the main contaminant of concern.

20 MS. FIELD: I'm not understanding. When you first put this on the screen, it looked
21 like all one plume. And as you, I guess, are showing the intensified concentrations, it looks like --

22 MR. MORRIS: It breaks apart?

1 MS. FIELD: -- it breaks into two. But why would you treat them separately if it
2 looks like it's the same chemical?

3 MR. MORRIS: Well, what has happened since the groundwater flows in this
4 direction toward the bay -- and not being a hydrogeologist, kind of bear with me and, Rich, chime
5 in -- we have a known source here, and it is slowly moving in the direction of groundwater flow
6 toward the bay, and it's going to continue moving this way. And then you have another source
7 here that's contributing and moving toward the bay.

8 You are going to have this plume. It's going to marry up down here. So that's
9 why that first one looked like one giant plume. But if you could look at it -- can we do the
10 cross-section?

11 MS. FIELD: Are you saying that if it were all coming from the first source, it would
12 become more dilute as it get towards the bay?

13 MR. MACH: It's actually more of a Navy requirement/contracting issue. We're
14 using a remediation contractor to do the investigation, and we started off with a plan to do
15 remediation, and then we thought we had to just get a little more data; went and got that; and we
16 still wanted to get on with the remediation.

17 And then it was like, well, we've got a little more, but now we need a little more.
18 We kept doing that, and we've got to break it at some point because we're walking a very fine line
19 having a remediation contractor do investigation type work. And I don't like it. I'm sure you
20 probably don't like to hear that, but those are the restrictions we have with the type of money we
21 have and the type of contract we have, so we've got to break this thing off somewhere.

22 And what we're trying to do is say, look, you know, as the concentrations begin
23 to decrease and then increase again, we can break it right there and say as it increases again, it can
24 only be increasing because of another source. So it's another area. We can go ahead and set up
25 another contract with the right type of funding and the right contract mechanism to finish that

1 investigation, but let's break it off so these guys have enough information to complete the
2 additional investigation they did and get on with remediating that site.

3 So we're not abandoning the second part, but --

4 MS. FIELD: I understand. I'm just trying to understand why you think it's coming
5 from a different source. And the reason is -- if I'm understanding you correctly, the reason you
6 think it's a different source is because normally as the plume starts to migrate towards the bay, it
7 would become more dilute.

8 MR. MACH: That's right.

9 MS. FIELD: And when you come upon an area closer to the bay that it's suddenly
10 more intense, then you assume that it must be doing that because it's coming from another source.

11 MR. MACH: Exactly. And we have other source areas or other areas that have
12 handled this type of material before in the past that we're reasonably sure probably are
13 contributing to that additional force, so, yes.

14 MR. GEILENFELDT: Did you guys list the area that goes into that CDF?

15 MR. MORRIS: Yes. Right here is Building 1 and 2. I think just beyond that is the--

16 MR. COLLINS: It goes below Site 1.

17 MS. FIELD: Below the CDF?

18 MR. COLLINS: Yes, at a good depth. It's not part of the CDF. It's almost a layer
19 cake there with one site is diving down and the other one is just the sediment that was
20 contaminated that went to the bay at one time.

21 Two unrelated issues in a vertical profile. They appear differently than they
22 would here.

1 MS. FIELD: But it's lower? It's underneath the CDF?

2 MR. COLLINS: It's not yet underneath it. We're at the very edge. We would have
3 to do more sampling to see the full extent.

4 MR. MACH: The wells in the CDF area to the depth that they are drilled did not
5 detect this. And based on the high concentrations, we're assuming it's gone far enough that it's
6 probably underneath those wells, but it's not at the shell elevation of those wells, but we don't have
7 any deep wells to confirm that.

8 MS. FIELD: Thank you.

9 MR. MACH: But we think it's probably that.

10 MR. MORRIS: Just to conclude: Again, the plan is that we're going to go ahead and
11 install these additional wells to get one last little bit of information, essentially to look at all
12 possible contaminants that may be at the site.

13 Right now we've been treating for just TCE. We'll put in some wells for the
14 multipurpose of making sure we confirm that the screening tool -- in fact, that those results are
15 equivalent to taking it to an offsite laboratory. And that also bound our plume, and we'll be
16 collecting some information that we can use to do some bench testing of some type of remediation
17 system.

18 So as soon as we finish the wells, we'll compile all the data again, and we need
19 to resubmit the report to the Water Board and DTSC. It was kind of part of our agreement today
20 that we would collect this last bit of data. They want it presented in a little more thorough format.
21 They want to see all the contaminants of concern. So we'll have all that information, compile it
22 into a report, get their buy off, and then propose to do some type of remediation at the site.

23 MS. FIELD: So you have not decided on the type of remediation you're doing for
24 either of these sites?

1 MR. MACH: We're pretty confident with what we're probably going to do, and it's
2 probably going to be two removal actions that happen some time in the near future. We may put
3 them together as one, but they're two different technologies.

4 One is in the source area in the groundwater. We will probably do some sort of
5 chemical oxidation, injection of a chemical which is going to essentially break down the TCE and
6 other chlorinated compounds to CO2 and water. Very similar or possibly even the exact same
7 chemicals that we're going to use for the Site 5 chemical oxidation project which we've talked
8 about in the past as well.

9 And then the second is to address the free product which is floating on the water
10 table, and we're kind of waiting to see how well the pilot test that Scott Haley presented earlier for
11 Site 9 goes because that's got the same stuff. It's got floating petroleum products with chlorinated
12 solvents mixed in. We want to see how that steam injection and SVE system work.

13 Assuming that that works really well, we're probably going to try and implement
14 the same thing here. Take the lessons learned from Site 9, take the same design parameters, and
15 go ahead and install a similar system here.

16 So those are the probable two technologies that we'll implement here. And like
17 Scott said, we're going to go out here, install these monitoring wells, get the data, put that together
18 in a package. If DTSC has some other comments on the remedial investigation work plan that we
19 need to address at the same time, we'll get all that data from DTSC and the Water Board to sit
20 down with us at a meeting and say, "Hey, you had these comments. Here's our draft responses.
21 Did we hit the mark? Is this what you're looking for?" Get that concurrent, and then go ahead and
22 set up a formal meeting to revise the work plan.

23 And then we can complete the additional health risk assessment for the site, as
24 well as any additional wells that might be needed to complete the delineation of our piece of the
25 plume, and then write the RI report and continue on with the removal actions.

1 MS. FIELD: That steam injection system, what does that do?

2 MR. MACH: Steam injection does several things: One is it heats up the free
3 product, the petroleum in the subsurface, and that's going to do a couple of things: one, most of
4 these chlorinated solvents once they're heated, they're going to volatilize. They're going to bubble
5 out of the product. And when you've got that soil vapor extraction system in there sucking off
6 those vapors from the soil, it's going to suck all those chlorinated solvents out that are heated up.

7 The second thing is when it heats up the petroleum that is floating there on the
8 water table, it makes it much more mobile. It will float. If you take molasses and you heat it up, it
9 flows better. Same thing with the product. By heating it up, we can get to a couple of wells faster
10 and we can suck it out of the ground in that formula. So that's what the steam does for us.

11 MS. FIELD: Thank you.

12 MR. MORRIS: Any other questions?

13 MR. COLLINS: Okay. Thanks, Scott.

14 Our next topic we originally had scheduled for Carla and Foster to talk about,
15 and Carla is not here tonight.

16 As we ended our meeting last month, the one thing we talked about was the
17 RAB membership drive, and John and Carla were going to get together and come up with some
18 ideas for advertisements and stuff. Maybe you can tell us where that is, John.

19 MR. LOCKE: Well, I spoke with Vicki -- I think her name is Raun -- from the
20 "Coronado Eagle," and she wants to do a feature story on the RAB to put in the paper, and she
21 couldn't do it this week. She went on vacation or something. So she'll be at the next meeting for
22 that. Carla and I are going to have to go talk to her and tell her what we want and what have you.

23 As far as any other work, putting an ad in the paper or anything like that, we still
24 haven't gotten together on that.

1 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

2 MR. LOCKE: Maybe we'll have a better report next meeting.

3 Are there any other suggestions from anybody?

4 MR. GEILENFELDT: City Hall has a posting on the door entry at the clerk's office
5 about this. I don't know how many people stop to read it, but it's posted.

6 MR. COLLINS: We have tried notices in hotels and motels and stores and every
7 place else. We may have to try that again. It's been difficult to get people to join the RAB to
8 commit themselves to coming every month or trying to come every month to participate to clean
9 up the neighborhood.

10 MR. LOCKE: Originally how did you get the RAB started?

11 MR. COLLINS: That very way. We put out notices, mailings. It's been on local
12 TV, radio, and the works. It was a mega effort.

13 MR. GEILENFELDT: I called Carla earlier and asked her how she was doing. She
14 at the time said she was extremely busy with some other matters and she just simply had not had
15 the time to do it yet.

16 MR. LOCKE: She's always out of town.

17 MR. COLLINS: Now, the other issue was how we conduct business; and then,
18 again, really how we will proceed with our period of questions and answers, things like that. And
19 we haven't really put a lot of thought into it since the last meeting or the meeting before either, and
20 I don't know.

21 Did you want to bring up anything at this time, Foster?

22 MR. MARSHALL: Well, let me just say a couple of things or it might be more than
23 a couple of things.

1 One of the things -- and I'm probably the newest member of the RAB -- one of
2 the things that I noticed when I came in is that we're talking Greek to a bunch of southern English
3 speaking -- southern American English speakers.

4 Janet gets up and gives a beautiful thing in her language, and you have to
5 explain what she just said. Someone else gets up and gives a beautiful talk and has to repeat it. A
6 question comes from the floor that "Well, what did you just say?"

7 And it's an old instruction that I've heard, and I'm sure you all know what it
8 means. Do you know what KISS means? That's for those of us -- keep it simple, stupid.

9 And one of the problems that I run into is I sit up here, and you and I have talked
10 a couple of times together. I asked you to give me some information about the toxic stuff that was
11 blowing out, and I've gone to the computer and I've got, as you can see, a whole bunch of stuff
12 here that I've learned about toxicity. I'm a physician, and I'm interested in the deaths and the
13 mortality and the cancers and all this kind of crazy stuff that comes from this, and I won't give
14 that talk tonight because that could be another hour.

15 But anyway, the thing that I've found out is that I come in here and I sit, and I've
16 read all this stuff, and I've learned about it, and I've tried to get into it, but I still see people trying
17 to talk -- you guys get together and you all talk this jargon like it's routine. You bring it in here
18 and you talk to us, and unless you know what you're talking about -- just like TCE. Nobody
19 knows what that is. I've got a piece of paper that says that's trichloroethene, but I'm not sure that
20 you knew it. Did you know what it meant? Did you know what it meant?

21 MR. GEILENFELDT: Yeah. I've read some manuals.

22 MR. MARSHALL: See, a lot of people may not know what it is. So I think we need
23 to bring this thing down to a basic level.

1 I had a professor in surgery that used to tell me "Bring it down to a third grade
2 level and everybody will understand it."

3 So what my -- one of the things we talked about amongst the people that shared
4 this was to bring this thing down to a level where we all can talk, and then we might not have to
5 have all these questions to ask, because questions asked slow down the meeting, and that was the
6 whole gist of what we were all trying to do is get the meeting to go quicker. My nose is stopped
7 up, so you all forgive me. It's been killing me since December and it's still killing me.

8 And that's sort of the general gist. For example, and I don't want to criticize you,
9 but let me just say -- let's do the plume thing. That was a better one. Here you've got a plume. It's
10 a beautiful thing. You've got all these graphics, and it just looks great. And then somebody has to
11 say "Well, what happens to it?"

12 That's acceptable because, gee, this here plume -- don't say "this here" because
13 that's not good English, but that's what we would say -- but this plume is sitting there and it flows
14 underneath the thing we've already built, and it hasn't flowed there yet that we know of, but it's got
15 a lot of toxic stuff -- not TCE, but trichloroethene, which is real toxic.

16 And you can say when I try trichloroethene itself, it may not kill me, but its
17 vinyl chloride by-product is going to give me cancer of the blah, blah, blah.

18 So make it simple, and let it be so that we're all understanding what you are
19 saying. Even though we may understand what you're saying, but assume nothing because then you
20 make one of me and you.

21 And that's just the general gist that we came from in our discussion here. One of
22 the things that we all figured was a problem was there was so many questions that are asked while
23 you're presenting it that you end up talking not to the RAB members but to the people who are
24 asking the questions, who may not -- maybe the RAB members don't understand it either, and their
25 fortune is that somebody else has asked a question, if that makes sense to what we're trying to do.

1 But let us know what you're talking about, not in your language, but bring it
2 down to my language; and then when you bring it down to my language, I won't have many
3 questions and I'll understand what's going on. I will say that the -- what do you call that thing
4 when you stick it down and get it hot and bubble it out? We've talked about that about 50 times,
5 so I think we know what that high intensity heat goes down and does.

6 But I'm just trying to say keep it simple, stupid. That's my comments.

7 MR. COLLINS: Thank you.

8 MR. MACH: Do you think that some sort of summation/evaluation at the end of the
9 RAB meeting would be good; that you guys kind of critique us, the presenters, on how we did?
10 That feedback is important. If we think that you totally understand it, and it's going totally over
11 your head, it
12 doesn't do either one of us any good. We need the feedback from you as to --

13 MR. MARSHALL: That's probably why you don't get any members because they
14 come in here and say, "Whoa, what's going on in this crazy place? This is a bunch of Martians in
15 here." And so they leave and go out and tell everybody what a crazy bunch of people they are.

16 I go tell people I'm an R-A-B member and they say, "What are you talking
17 about?" And I try to say, "Well, what am I talking about."

18 So if we could bring it to a point where -- but there is advertisements in the
19 paper. I've seen three articles in there that look pretty good, but only at the very end of the article
20 "We need members" or "Volunteer for membership." That's how I joined. I saw an ad that said
21 you wanted members. I got it, and I don't know what I can do with it now.

22 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

23 MR. MARSHALL: But I think a critique would be good after somebody finishes.

1 MR. GEILENFELDT: Foster, if you've done all this survey on all these
2 terminologies, why don't we get you to give us a little class on what you've found out?

3 MR. COLLINS: That's an excellent idea.

4 MR. MARSHALL: That'd be all right.

5 MR. GEILENFELDT: I mean, I can't say I know all these terms. I've picked up
6 some knowledge from reading manuals, but obviously you have a lot more material than I have
7 with respect to understanding these terms.

8 MR. MARSHALL: Well, let me tell you why I did it. As I said, I'm a physician and
9 I'm worried about cancer.

10 MR. GEILENFELDT: Carcinogenics, you bet.

11 MR. MARSHALL: I see cancer patients a lot, and it's kind of a sad situation, and I
12 hear all this stuff about all this stuff going from North Island all over Coronado.

13 And in a very -- not a good statistic study; kind of poor, in other words -- I
14 started looking at who has cancer in Coronado -- that's a tough thing to decide -- from certain
15 types of toxicity. I can't find very many. So I then said, "Well, gee, if there's not very many, what
16 kind of cancers do we see from this toxic substance?" And the kind of cancers are kind of rare.
17 There's liver tumors and there's brain tumors and there's vascular tumors and all these kinds of
18 crazy things. If you had a lot of this going on, you'd hear about it because word of mouth from
19 either garbage people or whoever, you'd hear about diseases. We don't hear about all that.

20 I hear about the guys that live right around the peripheral: Alameda and all those
21 places over there. Those folks live to be about 100. Most of them are pretty old and cranky and
22 like the rest of us that are getting old.

23 And so I started looking into it to see what I could find, and this is why I got
24 interested.

1 MR. GEILENFELDT: So you feel that the concern of containment here is important
2 to limit this carcinogenic threat. That's what these gentlemen are trying to do.

3 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

4 MR. GEILENFELDT: That's the same thing I'm interested in.

5 MR. MARSHALL: Right. But I'm not sure -- and I have to say this with a little
6 hesitancy -- I'm not sure we're chasing a Tasmanian devil in San Diego, and there ain't no
7 Tasmanian devil except out at the Wild Animal Park.

8 MR. GEILENFELDT: If you saw some of this equipment that was demonstrated
9 today, Foster, you probably would have a little more confidence in what they're doing to minimize
10 the future recurrence of this.

11 As you know, all of what we're talking about now has been going on for 50
12 years. What the Navy's doing now, if you could see some of this new equipment, is incredible. I
13 was impressed.

14 MR. MARSHALL: I went out and looked at it. What's the site that has the boiling,
15 burning field? What's that called?

16 MR. COLLINS: The old fiery marsh.

17 MR. MARSHALL: Those things are working great out there. But what I'm trying to
18 say is I don't know how much damage it's really doing to people. That's the thing that I'm getting
19 concerned about is much ado about nothing. Who was it that said that? Was that Mr. Bill?

20 MR. GEILENFELDT: But don't you think what's important here is making sure that
21 it's creating programs of future occurrence?

22 MR. MARSHALL: Absolutely. I'm not minimizing what is happening. I'm saying
23 we've got to do it, but I think we also should put out scare tactics and say you guys -- everybody's

1 got to dig up the ground and dig a bigger hole so they can hide from all these toxics in the air
2 because there's a lot more toxics coming from a lot of other places than North Island.

3 MR. GEILENFELDT: Go down here to this industrial plant and the boat repair
4 place. That's where most of it is. That concerns me more than what the Navy's doing here, what
5 goes on on the other side of the bridge.

6 MR. MARSHALL: Did any of you paint your house? Anybody painted the inside
7 of their house recently? Smells kind of strong, doesn't it? Ever put up linoleum in the house?
8 Smells kind of strong, doesn't it? It's got a lot of vinyl chloride in it. That's lethal stuff. It smells
9 terrible, but you air your house out, don't you. Well, what happens? It dilutes and gets thrown out
10 all over the place.

11 Same thing with all this stuff that's done right here, but I want to make sure that
12 it's not going -- I live not too far from the base, and I've been over here three years. I don't think
13 my liver's gotten bad yet, but I've got to worry about it.

14 So for all these Navy people that live here, they drink a lot, so I don't know
15 whether their liver trouble is from the drinking or the poisons. I'm just teasing.

16 But my intesest is because I want to see if we are causing some cancers and
17 stuff. And if we are, we need to absolutely scrape it all off and put it in the middle of the desert
18 somewhere. If we're not, then we need to clean it up the best we can and go from there.

19 MR. GEILENFELDT: Your point is well made.

20 MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Foster.

21 I'll tell you what we will do is we will draft up a form to evaluate these
22 meetings, and we'll bring one to the next meeting.

23 MS. WANKIER: I just wanted to make a comment. I'm new at these meetings, and
24 I have to write the minutes; and for me, too, it was difficult in coming into a hazardous waste

1 environment, no pun intended on that. But the acronymn list really helped me get acclimated to
2 some of these chemicals that are being extracted and identified, and some of the bases and this
3 type of thing.

4 So the acronym list really helped, just taking that and reading through it and
5 identifying the different acronym usage because I know in the military that's very common to
6 speak in the acronym language, and just acclamating myself to that list really helped make this
7 more interesting. It might help.

8 MR. MARSHALL: Good point.

9 MR. COLLINS: I would like to say one thing, though.

10 In the past we did have one RAB member here who thought we should keep it at
11 a higher level and cause the RAB to learn, to be brought up to that level.

12 Now, that same night another person in the public participation, DTSC, said no,
13 we should bring it back down again. Bring it at least around to the 7th or 8th grade level and not
14 keep it up there at the high school or first two years of college.

15 So there's a difference in the viewpoint of where it ought to be. But if it's too
16 hard to understand at the level that we're doing, then we can make the effort to bring it down a bit
17 so that it's easier to understand. Maybe that would help. Maybe we'd get more members.

18 MR. MARSHALL: The most intelligent man I've ever heard of or known was a
19 fellow named Einstein, and he said, "Keep it simple, stupid," and you know you could never talk
20 to him. But he knew where to look things up. That's the only difference between us is he knew
21 where to look things up. I didn't.

22 MR. MACH: And you guys are more than welcome at any time during our
23 presentation to say, "Hey, stop. What are you saying? I don't understand you."

24 MR. COLLINS: Don't be afraid to speak up if you don't understand.

1 MR. MACH: A lot of times if we don't get a comment, we think you understand and
2 we keep pushing on through.

3 MR. COLLINS: Okay. I wanted to remind you that there was another handout in
4 the back and as we promised two months ago, we have started to produce a list with a little
5 snapshot of other projects that we're working on.

6 Now, these were not presented tonight, but you can see what else is going on.
7 And if there's something that strikes your interest, at a future time you can ask for us to give a
8 presentation on it. You can pick a particular project and say, "Well, I'd like to know more about
9 IR Site 5 monitored natural attenuation" or something like that, and we can talk about it. We can
10 plan better.

11 MR. GEILENFELDT: Is this the update like we got last month?

12 MR. COLLINS: Right. And it should help you. It just gives you an idea of what
13 else is going on because there is an awful lot going on. In fact, this could be described as the short
14 list.

15 And the one thing we need to do --

16 MR. MACH: I have two announcements: One, it didn't get put on the agenda, but I
17 was asked to -- I did a presentation last month about the training needs, and when we can get
18 training on it. We had hoped to get the relative risk onto this night's agenda; however, Michael
19 Pound from our office, who is going to do that presentation, was unavailable for tonight, but he
20 will be available for the October 21st meeting. So we are going to schedule him for October 21st
21 to talk about the relative risk.

22 The ranking process of all of our sites and all of the Department of Defense sites
23 and then actually how our sites rank up against all the other sites in the Department of Defense and

1 how we get our money, and then Bill's going to follow that up with what our fiscal year 2000
2 budget is going to be and the projects we plan to award next year.

3 The second thing that we wanted to talk about was to get Charles Cheng from
4 the Water Board back here to give a presentation on groundwater, how the local groundwater is
5 and how our particular groundwater acts. He gave a presentation to the RAB about three years
6 ago, and so I've asked him to come back and do a similar presentation. And I spoke to him today,
7 and he has tentatively said that he can make the December 1st meeting, so we'll get that on.

8 And then one of the other presentations that we talked about was to get
9 Innovative Technology to make about a 30-minute presentation on one technology, see how you
10 guys like it, and probably try to pick one that we're going to try to implement. I'm thinking that
11 chemical oxidation, which we talked about for both Site 5 and for Operable Units 19 and 20,
12 would be a good technology to present on that. So we'll probably try to plan on that for the
13 January meeting.

14 So those would be the next three upcoming sessions, one per RAB meeting for
15 the next three.

16 And with that, if you recall at the last meeting, we also wanted to try to pick
17 RAB meeting dates for the entire rest of the year 2000, and we did that. We got the third
18 Thursday of every month for next year, and that includes January, February, March, April, May,
19 June, no meeting in July, August, September, October, November, and no meeting in December.
20 So ten meetings next year, the third Thursday of each month.

21 MR. COLLINS: Do you want to read them off?

22 MR. MACH: I can read them off real quick.

1 It will be January 20th; February 17th; March 16; April 20th; May 18th, June
2 15th; again, none in July; August 17th; September 21st; October 19th; November 16th; and, again,
3 none in December.

4 And those will all be on the agenda when it comes out again next month.

5 MR. COLLINS: Do we have any other public comments or questions?

6 MR. GEILENFELDT: I wanted to make a formal request to be allowed to see these
7 sites, and Bill had already told me you were willing to do that, and any other RAB member who's
8 interested in going out to see the sites.

9 MR. COLLINS: Anybody who hasn't been out to see the sites, give me a call.

10 MS. FIELD: I might be interested, depending on when you're doing it.

11 MR. MACH: Why don't we make it an agenda topic for the next RAB meeting to --
12 we'll put out a request to see who is interested, pick a time that will meet everyone's schedule, and
13 set it up for some time in late October or early November and go out there.

14 MR. COLLINS: Good.

15 And with that, if there's nothing else you want to talk about, this meeting is
16 concluded.

17

18 (Whereupon, at 7:50 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

19

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)

2 : ss.

3 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO.)

4
5
6
7 I, Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870, hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the above
8 proceedings, on Thursday, September 16, 1999, at 640 Orange Avenue, Winn Room, in the City
9 of Coronado, County of San Diego, State of California; and I do further certify that the above and
10 foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to 56, inclusive, contain a true and correct transcript of all of
11 said proceedings.

12 DATED: _____, 1999.

13
14
15
16
17 _____
18 Nancy A. Lee
19